



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/685,190

10/14/2003

Gary Marr

9400-60

4174

39072

7590

10/16/2008

AT&T Legal Department

Attn: Patent Docketing

Room 2A-207

One AT&T Way

Bedminster, NJ 07921

EXAMINER

CHONG CRUZ, NADJA N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/685,190	Applicant(s) MARR, GARY	
	Examiner NADJA CHONG CRUZ	Art Unit 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9 and 11-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9 and 11-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) ☐ Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This is a Final office action in reply to the response filed on 14 July 2008.
2. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-9 and 13-17 have been amended.
3. Claims 4 and 10 have been canceled.
4. Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-17 are currently pending and have been examined.
5. The rejections of claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-17 have been updated to reflect the amendments.

Response to Amendment

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.
7. The objection of the specification stands because all registered trademarks have not been properly identified.
8. The rejection of claims 3-4, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 17 under 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph is withdrawn in light of Applicant's argument and amendments. However a new rejection has been asserted below, as necessitated by amendment.
9. The rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 USC § 101 is withdrawn in light of Applicant's arguments and amendments.

Specification

10. The use of the trademarks INFORMIX, MICROSOFT and JAVA has been noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

11. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks. See MPEP § 608.01(v) for further information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
- The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
13. Claims 1, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
14. As per claims 1, 8 and 13 recites the limitation *two different types of relational database*. Examiner is not clear that a relational database has two different types. Databases are classified as Hierarchical model, network model, relational model (e.g., relational database), object-oriented model and semistructured model (see attachment: Database Models: Hierarchical, Network, Relational, Object-Oriented and Semistructured, pages 1-3, 2001). If Applicant is referring to the limitations of canceled claims 4 and 10, please see the rejection in the previous Office Action, where Gabbita disclose “a database management system, such as an Oracle database” (column 16, lines 8-9) which is a well known relational database system (Gabbita, column 4, lines 60-61). For the purposes of this examination, *two different types of relational database* will be interpreted as *two relational databases*. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments received on 14 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

16. With regard to claims 1, 8 and 13, Applicant argues that the prior art of record, specifically that Gabbita and Lickiss (1) *does not disclose or suggest such use of first and second relational database* (Page 10, Second Paragraph).
17. In response to applicant's argument (1). Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, Examiner submits that such a feature is merely a design choice that does not functionally affect the monitoring service order processing in a service order process of the present invention and thus should not be given patentable weight. See MPEP §2144.04, IV, section B. Second, Applicants merely allege that Gabbita and Lickiss fails to teach such a feature without clearly establishing what the deficiencies in Gabbita and Lickiss are, since, both Gabbita and Lickiss teaches a relational database to extract and store service order information for a service order process. Examiner interprets this to be a mere allegation of patentability and thus Applicants arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.11 I(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.
18. Furthermore, Gabbita disclose "a database management system, such as an Oracle database" (column 16, lines 8-9) which is a well known relational database system (Gabbita, column 4, lines 60-61) where the Oracle database management system enables a user to create multiple relational databases (e.g., first and second relational databases) in one database server "a single database server system with two databases: *production* and *test*" (SGI, page 2, 4th ¶).
19. With regard to claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 11-12 and 15-17, Applicant made a general argument that these claims are not disclosed in the references. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Applicant has not given any reasons for this conclusion. Therefore, the rejection stands.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 20.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 21.** Claims 1 -17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabbita et al (US 6,349, 238 B1) hereinafter "Gabbita" in view of SGI TPL (IRIX 6.5: Administrative/PCP_ORACLE - Chapter 3. Managing Multiple ORACLE Databases) http://techpubs.sgi.com/library/tpl/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?coll=0650&db=bks&fname=/SGI_Admin/PCP_ORACLE/ch03.html; 1998, hereinafter "SGI" and further in view of Lickiss et al (US 6,104,798), hereinafter "Lickiss".

Claim 1:

Gabbita as shown discloses a method of monitoring service order processing in a service order process, the method comprising:

- *extracting service order information for the population of service orders from a first database* (column 21, lines 54-55: which teaches "information that is extracted from the DBMS **104** by LSAT **102** to select and process Service Orders" where service order information is extracted from a database);
- *and storing the extracted service order information in a second database*, (column 16, lines 8-9, column 30, lines 35-39 and 41-43: which teaches that "a database management system, such as an Oracle database is used to store such data" where "LSAT **102** maintains a History File of the significant events that occur within the system as it pertains to each Service Order" and "[a] LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken" where History File functions as

- a database backup to record and stored all “transaction processing activities, system access information, and administrative manipulation of system data”);
- *identifying transitions in the status identifiers by comparing service order status identifiers in the extracted service order information stored in the second database;*(Figure 5, reference character 518,Figure 2, which it illustrates the workflow for processing service orders, column 12, lines 8-22, column 28, lines 13-18, which teaches a block diagram showing a plurality of database tables, database table fields and relationship between database tables and/or fields where the Local Service Activity Tracker (LSAT) transition table contains information such as transition identification, name and type (e.g., status identifies) where “[i]f the Work Step is associated with a Jeopardy point, then the process compares the completed date and time with the scheduled date and time for the Work Step”. Gabbita teaches that the process compares the completed date and time (e.g., comparing service order status identifiers) which the data was previously stored in the history file of the LSAT, since “LSAT 102 tracks the status of each Work Plan against the planned schedule”);
 - *storing records of the identified transitions and corresponding times of the identified transitions in the second database* (column 30, lines 41-45: which teaches that “LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where “[h]istory File data” (e.g., storing records of the identified transitions and corresponding times) “for Work Steps include actual step completion times as well as planned start and finish times” which teaches an history tracking for each service order status and times stored in the LSAT database);
 - *analyzing the stored records of the identified transitions to determine completion intervals for the stages;* (column 30, lines 42-65 and column 9, lines 31-38: “This information permits the comparison of standard intervals defined for a Work Plan

with actual completion data enabling the fine tuning of Workflow intervals.”, where “LSAT **102** calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps” which completion intervals can be determined);

- *and computing an aggregate measure of progression of the population of status orders through the service order process from the determined completion intervals.* (column 12 lines 16-18: which Local Service Activity Tracker (LSAT) track the status and times of each service order and “compares the completed date and time with the scheduled date and time for the Work Step” also as discussed above “LSAT **102** calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps”, which teaches the progress of each service order);

Gabbita disclose “a database management system, such as an Oracle database” (column 16, lines 8-9) which is a well known relational database system (Gabbita, column 4, lines 60-61). Gabbita does not specifically disclose *two relational databases*, however SGI in an analogous art of multiple databases in one database server for the purpose of creating two relational databases (page 2, 4th ¶) as shown does:

- *wherein the first and second databases are two relational databases* (pages 1-7, Chapter 3, Managing Multiple ORACLE Databases, where the Oracle database management system enables a user to create multiple relational databases (e.g., first and second relational databases) on one Database Server “a single database server system with two databases: *production* and *test*”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Oracle database management system as taught by SGI, to improve Gabbita, thereby giving the predictable result of better use of resources through "a single database server system with two databases" (page 2, 4th ¶) .

Gabbita teaches that the "LSAT 102 tracks the status of each Work Step from the time it is scheduled (status of pending) through the time it is being acted upon (status Current) until it is reported completed (status Complete)." (Gabbita, column 18, lines 6-9). Gabbita does not disclose the following limitation, however Lickiss in an analogous art of monitoring service order processing for the purpose of tracking the stage of the service order process (column 11, lines 5-7) as shown, does:

- *generating respective series of successive time samples of service order information for respective service orders of a population of service orders, (column 4, lines 21-26 and column 7, lines 12-16: "...the CD Server updates status of each order in the Order Tracking Database..." where "... a variety of reports can be generated to provide more accurate and timely status information....", which the CD Server provides reports such as "front-end rejects, outbound installs, outbound disconnects, batch status, aged LEC rejects, pending LEC action, batch summary, and LEC disconnects to the customers via the GUI 110");*
- *the service order information including respective status identifiers that indicate a relationship of respective service orders to a stage of the service order process; (Figure 10 and column 11, lines 5-7: reference character 555, "Transaction Code Status Indicator" and "... reporting and status files will contain either reject codes, pending codes, disconnect and install codes", which teaches an status codes identifying each stage of the order process);*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method for managing the workflow for processing service orders of

Gabbita with the technique of order processing and reporting system, as taught by Lickiss because a customers “can view the status of their orders in real-time” and monitor their service order process, since the database updates the status of each service order and “a variety of reports can be generated” in order “to provide more accurate and timely status information” (Lickiss, column 4, lines 23-26), then, this will improve the tracking service order process efficiency when an order is delayed, since the company employees “can immediately determine the cause of the delay so that corrective action can be taken before the delay becomes critical.” (Gabbita, column 2, lines 13-15).

Claim 2:

Gabbita as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *extracting service order information for the population of service orders from the first database for a first time;* (column 21, lines 54-55: which teaches “information that is extracted from the DBMS **104** by LSAT **102** to select and process Service Orders” where service order information is extracted from a database);
- *storing the extracted service order information for the first time in a second database;* (column 30, lines 35-39 and 41-43: which teaches that “LSAT **102** maintains a History File of the significant events that occur within the system as it pertains to each Service Order” and “[a] LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where History File functions as a database backup to record and stored all “transaction processing activities, system access information, and administrative manipulation of system data”);
- *extracting service order information for the population of service orders from the first database for a second time succeeding the first time;* (column 21, lines 54-55: “...information that is extracted from the DBMS **104** by LSAT **102** to select and

process Service Orders” where information can be extracted many time as needed);

- *and storing the extracted service order data for the second time in the second database;* (column 30, lines 35-39 and 41-43: “LSAT **102** maintains a History File of the significant events that occur within the system as it pertains to each Service Order” and “As LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where History File functions as a database backup to record all data such as “transaction processing activities, system access information, and administrative manipulation of system data”);
- *wherein identifying transitions in the status identifiers by comparing service order status identifiers in the extracted service order information stored in the second database comprises comparing service order status identifiers for the first time in the extracted service order information stored in the second database to the extracted service order status identifiers for the second time in the extracted service order information stored in the second database to identify at least one transition in a service order status identifier for at least one service order.* (column 30, lines 42-65, column 9, lines 31-38 and column 12, lines 8-22: which teaches “[t]his information permits the comparison of standard intervals defined for a Work Plan with actual completion data enabling the fine tuning of Workflow intervals.”, where information is obtained from the History File and then “LSAT **102** calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps”. which teaches that “the process compares the completed date and time with the scheduled date and time for the Work Step”. Gabbita teaches that the process compares the completed date and time (e.g.,

comparing service order status identifiers) which the data was previously stored in the history file of the LSAT, since “LSAT 102 tracks the status of each Work Plan against the planned schedule”):

Claim 3:

Gabbita as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein storing the extracted service order information for the second time in the second database is preceded by archiving the service order information for the first time; (column 30, lines 35-39 and 41-43 and column 31 lines 5-6: which teaches that “LSAT 102 maintains a History File of the significant events that occur within the system as it pertains to each Service Order” and “[a]s LSAT 102 tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where History File functions as a database backup to archive all information related to “transaction processing activities, system access information, and administrative manipulation of system data” and “[a]rchived data may still be accessed and reports may still be generated on this data”);*
- *wherein storing the extracted service order information for the second time in the second database comprises overwriting the service order information for the first time with the extracted service order information for the second time; (Figure 5, columns 23-28 and column 20, lines 65-67: which teaches that “step is completed after receiving confirmation that the number status has been updated from “Reserved” to “Working” where information is entered and updated into the LSAT database tables and their associated fields. When an update is made in the database, the initial value from the field is removed and it is replaced (e.g., overwritten) with a new value which is a database standard operation procedure);*
- *and wherein comparing service order status identifiers for the first time in the extracted service order information stored in the second database to service order*

status identifiers for the second time in the extracted service order information stored in the second database to identify at least one transition in a service order status identifier for at least one service order comprises comparing the stored service order information for the second time to the archived service order information for the first time to identify at least one transition in a service order status identifier for at least one service order. (column 30, lines 42-65, column 9, lines 31-38 and column 12, lines 8-22: which teaches “T[t]his information permits the comparison of standard intervals defined for a Work Plan with actual completion data enabling the fine tuning of Workflow intervals.”, where information is obtained from the History File and then “LSAT 102 calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps”. which teaches that “the process compares the completed date and time with the scheduled date and time for the Work Step”. Gabbita teaches that the process compares the completed date and time (e.g., comparing service order status identifiers) which the data was previously stored in the history file of the LSAT, since “LSAT 102 tracks the status of each Work Plan against the planned schedule”);

Claim 5:

Gabbita as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *determining, for the respective service orders, respective completion intervals between a first transition when a service order first arrives at a first stage and a second transition when the service order moves from a second stage following the first stage and on to a third stage following the second stage;* (column 30, lines 42-65 and column 9, lines 31-38: which teaches “[t]his information permits the comparison of standard intervals defined for a Work Plan with actual completion

data enabling the fine tuning of Workflow intervals.”, where “LSAT **102** calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps”. which completion intervals can be determined for each step or stage);

- *and storing the determined completion intervals in the second database;* (column 30, lines 35-39 and 41-43: which teaches that “LSAT **102** maintains a History File of the significant events that occur within the system as it pertains to each Service Order” and “As LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where History File functions as a database backup to record all data such as “transaction processing activities, system access information, and administrative manipulation of system data”);
- *and wherein computing an aggregate measure of progression of the population of status orders through the stages from the identified completion intervals comprises computing an average of the stored completion intervals* (column 3, lines 11-14 and column 5, lines 38-41: which teaches that “[d]etailed statistical information is maintained for audit and reporting purposes. Reports reflecting the effectiveness of workforce management and work administration is obtained” which teaches that information can be obtained from the database and any query can be performed since “...the web based interface module further provides query capability to provided customized views, reports and tracking information pertaining to current and past Service Orders.”);

Claim 6:

Gabbita as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *further comprising storing the computed aggregate measure in a spreadsheet (column 30 lines 39-40, column 31, lines 6-13 and column 5, lines 38-41: which teaches that the database provide query capability for customized reports, such as graphics and spreadsheets, since "all data is recorded in a manner that supports reporting".);*

Claims 7, 12 and 17:

Gabbita as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the service order process comprises a local exchange carrier (LEC) end user migration (EUM) process (column 3, lines 63-65: which teaches a "local exchange carriers (LECs) for processing orders for local and/or long distance telecommunication services" .);*

Claim 8

Gabbita as shown discloses a system for monitoring service order processing in a service order process, the system comprising:

- *a first database configured to stored service order information for a population of service orders, (column 4, lines 58-59: which teaches that "[t]he database **104** is used by LSAT **102** to store data associated with the processing and tracking of orders.");*
- *a second database configured to store extracted service order information from the first database, (column 16, lines 8-9, column 30, lines 35-39 and 41-43: which teaches that "a database management system, such as an Oracle database is used to store such data" where "LSAT **102** maintains a History File of the significant events that occur within the system as it pertains to each Service Order" and "[a] LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken" where History File functions as a database backup to record and stored all "transaction*

processing activities, system access information, and administrative manipulation of system data”);

- *to identify transitions in the status identifiers over the sets of service orders, (Figure 5, reference character 518 and column 28, lines 13-18, which teaches a block diagram showing a plurality of database tables, database table fields and relationship between database tables and/or fields where the Local Service Activity Tracker (LSAT) transition table contains information such as transition identification, name and type);*
- *to store records of the identified transitions and corresponding times of the transitions in the second database, (column 30, lines 41-45: which teaches that “LSAT 102 tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where “[h]istory File data” (e.g., storing records of the identified transitions and corresponding times) “for Work Steps include actual step completion times as well as planned start and finish times” which teaches an history tracking for each service order status and times stored in the LSAT database);*
- *to analyze the stored records of the identified transitions to determine completion intervals for the stages, (column 30, lines 42-65 and column 9, lines 31-38: which teaches “[t]his information permits the comparison of standard intervals defined for a Work Plan with actual completion data enabling the fine tuning of Workflow intervals.”, where “LSAT 102 calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps”. which completion intervals can be determined);*
- *and to compute an aggregate measure of progression of the population of status orders through the stages from the determined completion intervals. (column 12*

lines 16-18: which Local Service Activity Tracker (LSAT) track the status and times of each service order and “compares the completed date and time with the scheduled date and time for the Work Step” also as discussed above “LSAT **102** calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps”, which teaches the progress of each service order);

Gabbita disclose “a database management system, such as an Oracle database” (column 16, lines 8-9) which is a well known relational database system (Gabbita, column 4, lines 60-61). Gabbita does not specifically disclose *two relational databases*, however SGI in an analogous art of multiple databases in one database server for the purpose of creating two relational databases (page 2, 4th ¶) as shown does:

- *wherein the first and second databases are two relational databases* (pages 1-7, Chapter 3, Managing Multiple ORACLE Databases, where the Oracle database management system enables a user to create multiple relational databases (e.g., first and second relational databases) on one Database Server “a single database server system with two databases: *production* and *test*”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Oracle database management system as taught by SGI, to improve Gabbita, thereby giving the predictable result of better use of resources through “a single database server system with two databases” (SGI, page 2, 4th ¶)

Gabbita teaches that the “LSAT **102** tracks the status of each Work Step from the time it is scheduled (status of pending) through the time it is being acted upon (status Current) until it is reported completed (status Complete).” (Gabbita, column 18, lines 6-9). Gabbita does not disclose the following limitation, however Lickiss in an analogous art of monitoring service order

processing for the purpose of tracking the stage of the service order process (column 11, lines 5-7) as shown, does:

- *the service order information including respective status identifiers that indicate a relationship of respective service orders to a stage of the service order process; (Figure 10 and column 11, lines 5-7: reference character 555, "Transaction Code Status Indicator" and "... reporting and status files will contain either reject codes, pending codes, disconnect and install codes", which teaches an status codes identifying each stage of the order process);*
- *and a service order monitor operative to generate respective series of successive time samples of service order information stored in the first database for respective service orders of the population of service orders, to store the time samples in the second database (column 4, lines 21-26, column 7, lines 12-16, column 10, lines 24-26: which teaches that "the CD Server updates status of each order in the Order Tracking Database" (e.g., time samples of service order information stored in the database) where "a variety of reports can be generated to provide more accurate and timely status information", which the CD Server provides reports such as "front-end rejects, outbound installs, outbound disconnects, batch status, aged LEC rejects, pending LEC action, batch summary, and LEC disconnects to the customers via the GUI 110". Further, Lickiss teaches that "[t]he LEC Status File is used to update the Status information in the order tracking database and is stored for a period of time");*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method for managing the workflow for processing service orders of Gabbita with the technique of order processing and reporting system, as taught by Lickiss because a customers "can view the status of their orders in real-time" and monitor their service order process, since the database updates the status of each service order and "a variety of

reports can be generated” in order “to provide more accurate and timely status information” (Lickiss, column 4, lines 23-26), then, this will improve the tracking service order process efficiency when an order is delayed, since the company employees “can immediately determine the cause of the delay so that corrective action can be taken before the delay becomes critical.” (Gabbita, column 2, lines 13-15).

Claim 9:

As per **claim 9**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 2. Accordingly, claim 9 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 2, as described above.

Claim 11:

Gabbita as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *further comprising a spreadsheet configured to store the computed aggregate measure.* (column 30 lines 39-40, column 31, lines 6-13 and column 5, lines 38-41: which teaches that the database provide query capability for customized reports, such as graphics and spreadsheets, since "all data is recorded in a manner that supports reporting".);

Claim 13:

Gabbita as shown discloses a computer-readable medium to monitor service order processing in a service order process, the computer-readable medium comprising:

- *code configured* (column 12, line 65: “The LSAT user interface at **120** is preferably an Intranet-based **118** application...”);
- *to identify transitions in the status identifiers over the sets of service orders by comparing service order status identifiers in the extracted service order information stored in the second database* (Figure 5, reference character 518, Figure 2, which it illustrates the workflow for processing service orders, column 12, lines 8-22, column 28, lines 13-18, which teaches a block diagram showing a plurality of database tables, database table fields and relationship between database tables and/or fields where the Local Service Activity Tracker (LSAT) transition table contains

information such as transition identification, name and type (e.g., status identifies) where “[i]f the Work Step is associated with a Jeopardy point, then the process compares the completed date and time with the scheduled date and time for the Work Step”. Gabbita teaches that the process compares the completed date and time (e.g., comparing service order status identifiers) which the data was previously stored in the history file of the LSAT, since “LSAT 102 tracks the status of each Work Plan against the planned schedule”;

- *code configured to store records of the identified transitions and corresponding times of the transitions in the second database (column 30, lines 41-45: which teaches that “LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where “[h]istory File data” (e.g., storing records of the identified transitions and corresponding times) “for Work Steps include actual step completion times as well as planned start and finish times” which teaches an history tracking for each service order status and times stored in the LSAT database);*
- *code configured to analyze the stored records of the identified transitions to determine completion intervals for the stages; (column 30, lines 42-65 and column 9, lines 31-38: “This information permits the comparison of standard intervals defined for a Work Plan with actual completion data enabling the fine tuning of Workflow intervals.”, where “LSAT **102** calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps” which completion intervals can be determined);*
- *and code configured to compute an aggregate measure of progression of the population of status orders through the stages from the determined completion intervals. column 12 lines 16-18: which Local Service Activity Tracker (LSAT) track*

the status and times of each service order and “compares the completed date and time with the scheduled date and time for the Work Step” also as discussed above “LSAT **102** calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps”, which teaches the progress of each service order);

- *wherein the code configured to generate respective series of successive time samples of service order information for respective service orders of a population of service orders comprises code configured to extract service order information for the population of service orders from a first database (column 21, lines 54-55: which teaches “information that is extracted from the DBMS **104** by LSAT **102** to select and process Service Orders” where service order information is extracted from a database);*
- *and to store the extracted service order information in a second database, (column 16, lines 8-9, column 30, lines 35-39 and 41-43: which teaches that “a database management system, such as an Oracle database is used to store such data” where “LSAT **102** maintains a History File of the significant events that occur within the system as it pertains to each Service Order” and “[a] LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where History File functions as a database backup to record and stored all “transaction processing activities, system access information, and administrative manipulation of system data”);*

Gabbita disclose “a database management system, such as an Oracle database” (column 16, lines 8-9) which is a well known relational database system (Gabbita, column 4, lines 60-61). Gabbita does not specifically disclose *two relational databases*, however SGI in an analogous art

of multiple databases in one database server for the purpose of creating two relational databases (page 2, 4th ¶) as shown does:

- *wherein the first and second databases are two relational databases* (pages 1-7, Chapter 3, Managing Multiple ORACLE Databases, where the Oracle database management system enables a user to create multiple relational databases (e.g., first and second relational databases) on one Database Server “a single database server system with two databases: *production* and *test*”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Oracle database management system as taught by SGI, to improve Gabbita, thereby giving the predictable result of better use of resources through “a single database server system with two databases” (SGI, page 2, 4th ¶) .

Gabbita teaches that the “LSAT 102 tracks the status of each Work Step from the time it is scheduled (status of pending) through the time it is being acted upon (status Current) until it is reported completed (status Complete).” (Gabbita, column 18, lines 6-9).Gabbita does not disclose the following limitation, however Lickiss in an analogous art of monitoring service order processing for the purpose of tracking the stage of the service order process (column 11, lines 5-7) as shown, does:

- *code configured* (column 6, line 43: “CD Server 130 is a software application”);
- *to generate respective series of successive time samples of service order information for respective service orders of a population of service orders*, (column 4, lines 21-26 and column 7, lines 12-16: which teaches that “the CD Server updates status of each order in the Order Tracking Database...” where “a variety of reports can be generated to provide more accurate and timely status information”, which the CD Server provides reports such as “front-end rejects, outbound installs, outbound disconnects, batch status, aged LEC rejects, pending LEC action, batch summary, and LEC disconnects to the customers via the GUI 110”);

- *the service order information including respective status identifiers that indicate a relationship of respective service orders to a stage of the service order process;* (Figure 10 and column 11, lines 5-7: reference character 555, "Transaction Code Status Indicator" and "reporting and status files will contain either reject codes, pending codes, disconnect and install codes", which teaches an status codes identifying each stage of the order process);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method for managing the workflow for processing service orders of Gabbita with the technique of order processing and reporting system, as taught by Lickiss because a customers "can view the status of their orders in real-time" and monitor their service order process, since the database updates the status of each service order and "a variety of reports can be generated" in order "to provide more accurate and timely status information" (Lickiss, column 4, lines 23-26), then, this will improve the tracking service order process efficiency when an order is delayed, since the company employees "can immediately determine the cause of the delay so that corrective action can be taken before the delay becomes critical." (Gabbita, column 2, lines 13-15).

Claim 14:

Gabbita as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the code configured to generate respective series of successive time samples of service order information for respective service orders of a population of service orders* (column 30, lines 39-40: "All data is recorded in a manner that support reporting")
- *comprises code configured to extract and store service order information for the population of service orders from the first database for a first time* (column 21, lines 54-55: which teaches "information that is extracted from the DBMS **104** by LSAT **102** to select and process Service Orders" where service order information is extracted from a database);

- *and to extract and store service order information for the population of service orders from the first database for a second time succeeding the first time;* (column 30, lines 35-39 and 41-43: which teaches that “LSAT **102** maintains a History File of the significant events that occur within the system as it pertains to each Service Order” and “[a] LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where History File functions as a database backup to record and stored all “transaction processing activities, system access information, and administrative manipulation of system data”);
- *and wherein the code configured to identify transitions in the status identifiers over the sets of service orders comprises code configured to compare the extracted service order status identifiers for the first time to the extracted service order status identifiers for the second time to identify at least one transition in a service order status identifier for at least one service order.* (column 30, lines 42-65, column 9, lines 31-38 and column 12, lines 8-22: which teaches “[t]his information permits the comparison of standard intervals defined for a Work Plan with actual completion data enabling the fine tuning of Workflow intervals.”, where information is obtained from the History File and then “LSAT **102** calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps”. Which teaches that “the process compares the completed date and time with the scheduled date and time for the Work Step”. Gabbita teaches that the process compares the completed date and time (e.g., comparing service order status identifiers) which the data was previously stored in the history file of the LSAT, since “LSAT 102 tracks the status of each Work Plan against the planned schedule”);

Claim 15:

Gabbita as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *code configured to determine, for the respective service orders, respective completion intervals between a first transition when a service order first arrives at a first stage and a second transition when the service order moves from a second stage following the first stage and on to a third stage following the second stage;* (column 30, lines 42-65 and column 9, lines 31-38: “This information permits the comparison of standard intervals defined for a Work Plan with actual completion data enabling the fine tuning of Workflow intervals.”, where “LSAT **102** calculates the planned start and finish times for each step using the customer requested delivery date (CRDD) and/or the customer committed due date (CCDD) as available. The planned delivery date of the Work Plan is calculated using planned start and finish times of the various Work Steps”. which completion intervals can be determined for each step or stage);
- *and code configured to store the determined completion intervals in the second database;* (column 30, lines 35-39 and 41-43: “LSAT **102** maintains a History File of the significant events that occur within the system as it pertains to each Service Order” and “As LSAT **102** tracks each Service Order through the lifecycle, it maintains a historical record of each Work Step completed and other important actions taken” where History File functions as a database backup to record all data such as “transaction processing activities, system access information, and administrative manipulation of system data”);
- *and wherein the code configured to compute an aggregate measure of progression of the population of status orders through the stages from the identified completion intervals comprises code configured to compute an average of the stored completion intervals.* (column 3, lines 11-14 and column 5, lines 38-41: “Detailed statistical information is maintained for audit and reporting purposes. Reports

reflecting the effectiveness of workforce management and work administration is obtained” which teaches that information can be obtained from the database and any query can be performed since “...the web based interface module further provides query capability to provided customized views, reports and tracking information pertaining to current and past Service Orders.”);

Claim 16:

Gabbita as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *further comprising code configured to store the computed aggregate measure in a spreadsheet* (column 30 lines 39-40, column 31, lines 6-13 and column 5, lines 38-41: which teaches that the database provide query capability for customized reports, such as graphics and spreadsheets, since "all data is recorded in a manner that supports reporting".);

Conclusion

- 22.** The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- Beck et al (US 5,883,946) discloses a method and apparatus for provisioning customized telecommunications services.
 - Zey et al (US 6,611,275 B1) discloses a method of and apparatus for communicating and scheduling change requests.
 - Gilles (US 6,137,873) discloses an automatic electronic telecommunications order translation and processing.

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Nadja Chong** whose telephone number is **570.270.3939**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **BETH BOSWEL** can be reached at **571.272.6737**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Application/Control Number: 10/685,190
Art Unit: 3623

Page 27

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window:**

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

/Nadja Chong/

Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623